

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 17, 18, 28, 35, 58, 61-64, and 68-71 are pending in this case. Claims 17, 28, and 68-70 are amended, and Claim 71 is added by the present amendment. The changes to Claims 17 and 28 are supported in the originally filed disclosure at least at page 10, lines 10-20, at page 11, lines 3-5, and at Figure 3. New Claim 71 is supported in the originally filed disclosure at least at page 12, lines 5-25. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 17, 28, 68, and 70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; Claims 17, 35, and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takagi, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0189557 A1, herein “Takagi”) in view of Engstrom (U.S. Pat. No. 6,944,482 B2), and further in view of Park, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0038982 A1, herein “Park”); Claims 28, 62-64, and 69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takagi, Engstrom, Park, and further in view of Hawkins, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,356,361 B1, herein “Hawkins”); and Claims 18 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takagi, Engstrom, Park, and further in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 7,110,796 B2).

At the outset, Applicants and Applicants’ representatives thank Examiner Leiby for the courtesy of an interview with Applicants’ representatives on July 1, 2010. The discussion during that interview is substantially reflected in the amendments and remarks presented herein. Further, Applicants request that, if any cosmetic issues are identified the claims, Examiner Leiby contact Applicants’ representatives to expedite correction of those issues.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 17 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as discussed during the interview, “a main control unit to control both said main display part and said LED display panel,” as recited by Claims 17 and 28, is supported in the

originally filed disclosure at least at Figure 3 and the associated description. During the interview, agreement was reached that Figure 3 and the associated description supported the above-quoted recitation of Claims 17 and 28. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that one of skill in the art would be enabled, according to the Figure 3 and the associated description, to make and/or use the claimed invention, in conformance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 68 and 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, Claims 68 and 70 are amended to be in conformance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 17, 28, 68, and 70, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Amended Claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, “a display control unit to control display contents . . . on the basis of user-created graphic pattern input display data input through said operation part” and “a main control unit . . . to register said user-created graphic pattern input display data input through said operation.”

As discussed during the interview, Takagi, Engstrom, and Park, even in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the above-quoted elements of amended Claim 17.

Takagi illustrates, at Figures 1 and 2, and describes, at paragraphs [0008], [0021], and [0022], a first display part 16 and a second display part 18 within a panel 22 of a cellular phone.

However, as discussed during the interview, Takagi is silent as to the display of any “user-created graphic pattern input display data input through said operation part” or the

registration of any “user-created graphic pattern input display data input through said operation part,” as recited by amended Claim 17.

Further, as discussed during the interview, Engstrom and Park fail to cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Takagi.

Engstrom illustrates, at Figures 3a and 3b, and describes, at column 5, lines 20-55, that “selective activation and deactivation of selected ones of LEDs 1114” is “responsive to the requests of various visualization agents 1104-1108 . . . to achieve the desired visualization for a corresponding non-visual aspect of wireless mobile telephony.” For example, Engstrom describes that “these telephony events include in particular the arrival of an incoming call, as well as the key stroking pattern for selecting a menu item.”

However, as discussed during the interview, Engstrom is silent as to any teaching or suggestion as to the display of any “user-created graphic pattern input display data input through said operation part” or the registration of any “user-created graphic pattern input display data input through said operation part,” as recited by amended Claim 17.

Further, as discussed during the interview, Engstrom describes that the LEDs 1114 may be selectively activated to teach a user how to stroke a pattern of keys for selecting a menu item but does not describe that the input of a stroked pattern of keys is registered as a graphic pattern. That is, even if a pattern of keys, which are indicated by the LEDs 1114, were stroked to select a menu item, Engstrom does not describe that the stroked keys are registered. Further, the stroked keys of Engstrom are not “user-created graphic pattern input display data,” as recited by Claim 17, because a pattern of stroked keys in Engstrom is merely a pattern to select a menu item.

Park describes and illustrates a convertible computer with a single rotatable display 20 but is silent as to the above-discussed features of Claim 17 that are deficient in Takagi and Engstrom.

Accordingly, because, Takagi, Engstrom, and Park, even in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the above-discussed features of Claim 17, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 17, and Claims 35 and 61, which depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

Claims 18 and 58 depend from Claim 17 and, therefore, patentably define over Takagi, Engstrom, and Park for at least the same reasons as Claim 17. Further, Lee which was additionally asserted against Claims 18 and 58 fails to cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Takagi, Engstrom, and Park with regard to Claim 17 and was not asserted for the features of Claim 17 that are discussed above as deficient in the combination of Takagi, Engstrom, and Park. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 18 and 58, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), be withdrawn.

Claim 28, while differing in scope and/or statutory class from Claim 17, patentably defines over Takagi, Engstrom, and Park for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to Claim 17. Further, Hawkins, which was additionally asserted against Claim 28, fails to cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Takagi, Engstrom, and Park and does not teach or suggest switching “between the registered user-created graphic patterns as the display contents of the LED display panel by operation of . . . said operation keys,” as recited by amended Claim 28.

Hawkins illustrates, at Figures 1A and 1B, and describes, at column 8, lines 14-45, a hand held device 102 having a jog rocker switch 126 operable when a lid 106 is closed to affect a main display unit 128. Hawkins describes that, although the device may be in a power-save state when the lid is closed, a user may actuate the jog rocker 126 to cause the device to transition from a power-save state to a power-on state and, thereby, make a main display 128 become operational by launching an application.

However, as discussed during the interview, Hawkins describes only a main display

unit 128 transitioning power states via jog-rocker switch 126 and is silent as to switching “between the registered user-created graphic patterns as the display contents of the LED display panel by operation of . . . said operation keys,” as recited by amended Claim 28.

Accordingly, because Takagi, Engstrom, Park, and Hawkins, even in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the above-discussed features of Claim 28, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 28 and Claims 62-64, which depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

New Claim 71 depends from Claim 17 and, therefore, patentably defines over Takagi, Engstrom, and Park for at least the same reasons as Claim 17. Claim 71 further defines the matrix arrangement of the LEDs which display user-created graphical pattern data, as described, for example, page 10, lines 10-20, and at page 11, lines 3-5.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Usha Munukutla-Parker
Registration No. 61,939

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)